THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. I. NEW SERIES. NO. 6 JUNE, 1951

I

YUGOSLAVIA—BEFORE THE DELUGE; AND AFTER

A SEEMINGLY unbridgable gulf divides the Yugoslavia of to-day from the relatively carefree Serbia of my earlier acquaintance. The story of these hardy people, 'tis true, is by no means free from its "purple patches," nor have Serbians at any time savoured to the full the ineffable delights of "every man under his vine and his fig tree." Even so, the present-day regimentation of this interesting people, the autocratic, atheistic character of their present leadership, must evoke in Serbian minds a longing for the dead-and-gone yesteryears.

It was a delightful and colourful experience to walk on Sundays in the Gardens of Kalimegdan, not only to enjoy the magnificent view over the Save and the Danube, but to observe those splendid young army cadets in their long pale blue coats and shiny top boots, showing themselves off before their admiring girl friends. When I became Bishop of Gibraltar, I had hoped to wander down the byways as well as the highways of Yugoslavia. But since my diocese extended from Lisbon on the west to Tiflis and Baku on the east, it was necessary to remain constantly on the move to superintend widely separated chaplaincies, visiting them each year, if and when possible. I had longed to make acquaintance with the famous monasteries, of which I had seen Petch, Dechani and one or two others. Never did there seem to be time, unfortunately, to travel as far afield as Nerez (Vodno) or Mileseva, perhaps the most interesting of all.

In 1933, when first I went as Bishop to Belgrade, King Alexander suggested that I make a stay in Zagreb, where we always had a number of British residents and many interesting friends, but no Anglican chaplain. Later, it was made possible to arrange for regular visits by one of my clergy. This brought me into pleasant contact with the Roman Catholic Archbishop Stepinats, with the sculptor, Mestrovic, and a number of highly interesting personalities.

As must be obvious, a Bishop of Gibraltar must work and travel "according to programme"—which has usually been agreed upon many weeks in advance. Rarely, therefore, does it become possible for him to forsake the highways. On one occasion, however, the steamer due to call at Mt. Athos failed to make the port, my carefully planned itinerary notwithstanding. Making the most of my opportunity, I took a fishing boat for 25 to 30 miles, walked 20 miles to Stagira, the birthplace of Aristotle, and arrived via Salonica four days late for my engagements.

On another occasion, to my secret joy, a fall of snow—six feet deep—at Svecan, which held me up in Yugoslavia, enabled me to discover something unique among the treasures of an Orthodox Church—a figure of the Madonna and Child sculptured in stone, and accorded a place of honour in a Pravoslav village church. The village was the remote settlement of Sokolica in the district of Mitrovica.

My diary notes: "The figures are of stone; the Madonna is seated on a wooden throne, dressed in the simple embroidered costume of the district. They are much venerated, and once a year hundreds of peasants assemble here for a festival. It would be most interesting to know the origin of these figures, and what the bishop of the diocese (Skoplye) thinks of it."

In May 1940, accompanied by the Bishop of Gloucester, the Bishop of Southwark, Canon J. A. Douglas and others, I paid visits to the eastern section of my diocese, the party being hospitably received by Mr. George Rendel, at that time His Majesty's Minister at our Legation at Sofia. At that moment German propaganda in Yugoslavia was in full blast, with luxury 'planes to Munich for national journalists, followed by two-hour banquets and a talking-to by Ribbentrop and others of Hitler's entourage. The Germans did things thoroughly!

This high-pressure propaganda notwithstanding, we found on all sides the keenest desire for English studies, a desire so sincere and pronounced, that I was tempted to inquire just how far back this pro-English sentiment might be traced. It was revealed that between the years 1800 and 1810 the Serbian writer, Dositey Obradovitch, travelled abroad and made a somewhat extended stay in England. He acquired a high regard for English literature, and on his return encouraged the study of the English language, literature and institutions among his fellow-nationals. The literary and educational studies which he promoted, formed the nucleus of cultural relations between the two countries. Our Press Bureau in Serbia during the war years was very active indeed, and the illustrated periodical *Donitsa*, which was to be found on most bookstalls, enjoyed wide popularity. I would like to pay tribute here to the British Council which, under the then leadership of Mr. Shillan, was doing most excellent work, but found itself unable to cope with the avalanche of students desirous of taking up courses in English.

My impression at the time was that we were never in a position to cope with the popular demand for English lessons, even in Belgrade, and that in the provincial centres the demand for English tuition was always far in excess of the supply.

Later, to my misfortune, I was to lose all my notes and diary of this vital transitional period. But I still retain a most vivid recollection of those pregnant December days. The main topics of conversation throughout Yugoslavia were the Greek victories over the Italians, German 'control' in Rumania, Hitler's scientifically-planned 'penetration' in Bulgaria, the inevitable question of a mobilization in Yugoslavia and, finally, the possible —or probable—reactions of the Government of Prince Paul in the event of an ultimatum from Berlin.

All too recent history has revealed in what manner these problems resolved themselves. Out of this welter of conflicting aims and ambitions, and emerging from the clash of rival 'isms,' one fact presented itself with cameo clearness: the sudden uprush of the instinct of a people, arising out of the very depths of the soul of Serbia. It was the instinct to put first things first, to sacrifice even the blessings of freedom and peace in order that righteousness, judgment and justice be ensured.

On the morning of that terrible Palm Sunday, 1941, Mr. Dew and Mr. Garran went together to Jevremova 57, (Anglican chapel), and carried off the chaplain and Mrs. Sitters to join the Legation Staff who, at a later hour, were removed to the safety of Avala. All having anticipated an early return to their homes, little or no baggage accompanied them. The Minister insisted that the entire party keep together on the journey to the coast. From there, some of the evacuees—selected by the Minister—including the Sitters, were conveyed by air to Athens.

An extract from a despatch from *The Times* correspondent at Istanbul, under date November 2nd, 1941, crystallizes the tragedy of the situation at the time:

> "One of the worst aspects of the policy of exterminating the Serbian element which is being pursued by the invaders of Yugoslavia—Germans, Italians, Hungarians and Bulgarians, to whom the Croats should be added—is the systematic persecution of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Hundreds, even thousands, of Serbians have been tortured or killed, including prelates and priests.
>
> "The Serbian Patriarch Gavrilo, after he had been imprisoned and ill-treated by the Germans in Belgrade, is now kept a prisoner in Rakovitsa monastery. The Orthodox Metropolitan Dositej of Zagreb, after he had been flogged, was expelled, and is now in Belgrade hospital. Bishop Nektarije of Tuzla had a narrow escape from Croat Ustashis. Bishop Plato of Banjaluka was tortured, and was then drowned in the river Vrbas; his mutilated body was recovered and buried by villagers. The fates of the Metropolitan Peter of Sarajevo and of Bishop Nikolaj of Mostar are unknown.
>
> "These facts, which are strictly authentic, have been officially brought to the knowledge of all free Christian Churches through the proper channels."

The Times followed this grim narrative of persecution with a further commentary on November 20th:

> "Articles published from the Inter-Allied Information Committee present a dreadful picture of the conditions in which millions of Europeans are living under the rule of Hitler. The bravest, the most intelligent, the most patriotic of them stand in hourly peril of being dragged before the shooting squad; the traitors and the venal are favoured; and only the most submissive can hope to exist in relative safety.
>
> "Even to acquiesce in the degradation of Nazi rule is no longer enough to secure that personal immunity from maltreatment which is the normal benefit of civilized government; for the barbarous prac-

tice of seizing innocent hostages and putting them to death, discarded in Europe for centuries, has been reintroduced by the Germans.

"In Yugoslavia, in Greece and other occupied countries, the same odious methods are being exploited in order to break down national resistance. The figures of the civilians shot or hanged are the most damning indictment of German rule that could be compressed into a few lines of print; and they tell only half the tale. In every occupied country hundreds, if not thousands, of men and women have been seized and carried away to prison or concentration camp. Many of these are never heard of again."

In the blackest hours of the country's destiny the leaders of the Serbian Church refused to be intimidated, sacrificing life and freedom if, as they were confident, such sacrifice would keep aglow the torches of faith and freedom. It was the moral support of the Church that led to the historic episode of March 27th, 1941, and repudiation of the signatures to the Axis Tripartite Pact. Croatian treachery and the overwhelming military might of the Axis broke down the resistance of the gallant, numerically inconsiderable, Yugoslav army. The guerrilla resistance continued, however, to the end.

The full brunt of Axis vengeance was directed throughout to the Serbian Church. In this fell work they had the enthusiastic co-operation of the Croatian Ustashi who, not content with the massacre of Serbian bishops, hundreds of priests and monks and more than 600,000 Orthodox Serbs regardless of sex or age, plundered Serbian churches and monasteries, and compelled thousands of the Orthodox to embrace Latin Catholicism. The treatment of the most eminent ecclesiastical dignitaries by the Germans, surpassed all imagination and credibility. These trials were endured with characteristic stoicism, priests and clergy sharing with their flocks indignities without precedent, fortified by their unshakable Christian convictions.

The armistice in May 1945 was destined to prove a bitter disappointment to the Serbian Church and people, the country being relegated to the Russian sphere of influence. Serbia, freed from Nazi-Fascist domination had merely exchanged one totalitarian overlord for another, found itself committed to the ruthless grip of an aggressive and atheistic communism. Galling though the yoke had been under Hitler, the Serbians could—and did—defend, although at frightful cost, the Christian conception of social life and the sanctity of human relations. The advent to power of a communist minority portended an intensification of the struggle. Militant and victorious communism was in the saddle, and with it inevitable depersonalization, hostility to religious and age-old conceptions of human freedom.[1]

The Serbs found themselves between the devil and the deep sea, recognizing the domination of Moscow to be more tyrannical than that of Berlin. British support for Michailovitch had been withdrawn. "All possible aid for Tito" was now the key-note of British foreign policy.

✝ H. J. Buxton, *Bishop.*

[1] Detachment from Cominform influence is now opening the way to.

III

ORTHODOXY, ANGLICANISM, AND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

THE Eastern Orthodox theologians who have been in contact with the theologians of the Anglican Communion or with their writings have generally classified Anglicanism among the various branches of Protestantism. But they have been impressed by the interest which Anglican theologians take in the Fathers, and have seen in Anglicanism an attitude to Catholic devotional tradition, which is less negative than the general Protestant attitude.

Anglicans are commonly supposed to make a comparison between the Christian Faith and a precious Greek vase broken in many pieces. The Anglican Church has various pieces, seeming to come from various parts of the vase, high, low and broad. They fit together badly, and Anglicans ascribe this to the loss of the rest of the vase, which they seek to recover by gifts from the other Christian Confessions. The Eastern Orthodox commonly reply that this is a more or less true account of the state of things in Western Christendom, since the schism of the West under the medieval Popes, and in particular since the Reformation and the counter-Reformation. But the Eastern vase, originally one of a pair with the Western, was not broken. Perhaps it was buried and suffered superficial damage and needs cleaning. But it is intact in structure and the Western vase could be reconstructed on the basis of a study of the Eastern vase.

But the metaphor needs more elucidation. The Catholic faith is not a sum of parts or even a skeleton made up of distinct bones. It is difficult to see how having a *part* of the truth can possibly be distinguished from having some error instead of the *other part*. Dogmatic truth is what is to be taught to children (and catechumens) about the essential obligations of every member of the Church in matters of belief. It is not a theological system; it is a starting-point. The Anglican Catechism says, "My godfathers and my godmothers . . . did promise and vow . . . in my name . . . that I should believe *all* the articles of the Christian faith." The Anglican form of agreement between the Anglicans and the Old Catholics says, "Each Church believes the other to hold *all* the essentials of the Christian faith." Therefore Anglican godfathers and godmothers, and also Old Catholics, seem to believe that Anglican children are to be taught, and that the Church of the Anglican Communion holds *all* that is really *de fide*. This claim is what is known as the claim to "intensive catholicity," to the *wholeness* of the faith, as it could be, or can be, held by a particular local Church. The Orthodox theologian makes this claim, in principle, not for the sum-total of the Orthodox Communion, but for every particular Orthodox Church. The particular parish or diocese, if really Catholic, is called to include all faithful Christians in the place, as distinct from the heretics and the sectarians. The particular Church is to be led into all truth. She will believe and teach *all* the articles of the faith and nothing else will be taught in her as if it were an article of the faith. This does not mean either theological perfection or catechetical efficiency. But it means

that the whole Creed is taught, in the true Catholic sense, without addition to it or subtraction from it. All that should be *de fide* is *de fide* and nothing more is *de fide*.

The Eastern Orthodox, when they consider the problem of the Anglican Communion, are inclined to criticize from this point of view both the presence of the Filioque clause in the English texts of the Nicene Creed, and the requirement of the Declaration of Assent to the 39 Articles, with the Prayer Book and the Ordinal in some important Anglican provinces. It is not to the point here that the Anglican Communion is coming to be in full communion with the Old Catholics, who have the Nicene Creed in the older or shorter text. Nor is it to the point, although interesting, that the 39 Articles are not in one uniform position in the canonical and legal systems of all the Anglican provinces. The point is the existence in any parish or diocese of what seems to be a confession of faith which every Christian coming to live in that diocese, if he wants to join in the life of the Church, must accept. The laity, we say, have nothing to do with the 39 Articles. The Orthodox are not very sure of that, if the clergy have to tell the laity that they accept them and preach in agreement with them, or at least not against them. That seems to make them similar in position to the profession of faith made by the Eastern Orthodox bishop on his consecration, and it seems to make them in some sense a standard of Orthodoxy for the local Church. The very term "Articles of Religion," often rendered, Ἄρθρα Πίστεως, in Greek, implies that idea. I will not go into details about the Eastern Orthodox criticism of the Articles. But you may notice Articles V, VIII, XIX, XXII and XXXI. The Filioque clause is reaffirmed in V. It is said in VIII that there was never any doubt in the Church about the books of the Hebrew canon and that the books of the Greek Old Testament, not in the Hebrew, are useful "for example of life and instruction in manners," but the Church does not apply them to establish any doctrine. This seems a direct hit at the scriptural proofs of prayer for the departed and some other practices. Article XIX compares the error of Rome in matters of faith to the unspecified errors of the Eastern Patriarchates. Article XXII, like Article XXXI, is really quite defensible from an Eastern Orthodox standpoint if it is literally interpreted because the Eastern Orthodox and Patristic teaching on the subjects concerned is distinguishable from the teaching of the 'Romish' or 'Romanensis' theologians. But these two articles look very much like an attack, in somewhat insulting language, on the common Catholic devotional tradition.

In the nineteenth century and sometimes in the twentieth century some of the Anglican theologians of the Evangelical Movement have said that reunion with the East cannot come without a doctrinal and liturgical revolution in the East, similar in principle to the Reformation, as they understand the Reformation. They have said that there can be no reunion with a Church which professes to offer the eucharistic sacrifice for the living and the dead, venerates pictures and relics, and invokes the saints. This is a clear and comprehensible position; the Eastern Orthodox naturally disagree with it, but they can understand it. There has been a suggestion

in more recent years, especially since the agreement between the Old Catholics and the Anglicans in 1931, that the Anglican Communion is quite ready to be in full communion with the Orthodox or any other Communion, without necessarily accepting the soundness of all its "doctrinal opinion and liturgical and devotional practice," on the sole understanding that the other Communion concerned will reciprocate. Intercommunion may imply that "each Church believes the other to hold *all* the essentials of the Christian faith." The word 'all' is a most important word in the agreement between the Old Catholics and the Anglicans. It seems to imply that what the Old Catholic Church does not hold essential is not essential in the belief of the Anglican Church and that what the Anglican Church does not hold essential is not essential in the belief of the Old Catholic Church (if "to hold" means to hold to be essential and to teach as the faith of the Church). This would mean complete dogmatic agreement from the Orthodox point of view. Doctrinal opinion which is not held to be essential, like liturgical and devotional practice, is not part of the subject-matter of dogmatic agreement except by way of its implications. If the Orthodox Church believed the Anglican Communion and the Old Catholic Communion to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith that would mean complete dogmatic agreement and complete reunion would be the natural consequence. But the difficulty lies in the word *all*. From the Orthodox Eastern standpoint you cannot draw up a creed or dogmatic definition and say without any reservations that it contains all the essentials of the Christian faith. You cannot even take the Bible itself with the books of the second canon which Anglicans call the Apocrypha and say of that book that it contains *all* the essentials of the Christian faith. You cannot even add to the Bible the Creeds, the dogmatic definitions of the Seven Ecumenical Councils and the principal Liturgies of Christian antiquity. Even if you add all the works of S. John of Damascus you are not a bit nearer to a book of which the Orthodox can say that it must contain all the necessary doctrine for every Christian man. By that time you have taken the discussion a very long way along a very dangerous road. For the Fathers and the Liturgies and even possibly the Bible contain much that is not essential besides the essentials of the Christian faith which they contain.

The agreement between the Anglicans and the Old Catholics was thus on the right lines in proceeding by way of a general declaration of mutual faith and confidence. "Each Church believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith." Whatever the Anglican Church holds to be essential is, without addition or subtraction, essential to Old Catholicism. Whatever the Old Catholic Church holds to be essential is, without addition or subtraction, essential to Anglicanism. What is not in the "common platform" of both is not essential. When the Mixed Dogmatic Commission of the Anglican Communion and a part of the Eastern Orthodox Communion met at Lambeth in 1931, a few months after the Anglican-Old Catholic concordat, the Orthodox (who did not include representatives of the great Russian Church), placed special stress on their criticisms of the retention in the Anglican Communion of the Filioque clause. The Old Catholic Church has removed this from the Creed. It was the Orthodox suggestion

that the Anglican Communion should accept the dogmatic definition of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, which the Old Catholics accept as one of the Ecumenical Councils (together with the earlier ecumenical decrees) and that they should make a common statement with the Orthodox about the authority of the Church in matters of faith. That was the statement about Holy Tradition, which involves saying that what is taught by *the Church* is divinely revealed. This seemed to Anglicans to be giving to future Ecumenical Councils a kind of " blank cheque," i.e. authority to declare to be essential doctrines which might not always have plain words from Holy Scripture to support them. But it seemed to the Orthodox that a very similar " blank cheque " is involved when the Anglican Communion says that she believes the Old Catholic Communion to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith. It should be remembered that the Orthodox do not believe in the infallibility of the majority vote in any Council, so that, if there should be an " Ecumenical Council " in the time to come, the Church of England would be free to reject it like any other Church if she considered it unfaithful to traditional Orthodoxy in its decrees. The " blank cheque " is one that cannot be cashed without the signatures of all who have given it. What it really means is that, on reunion, we become One Church, and we trust the Holy Spirit to guide us as one Church in coming to a common mind whenever coming to a common mind is essential. But to have reunion in that sense we must become one communion and not merely two communions with ' intercommunion ' between them. We must have arrived already at a common mind to a very great extent. This is far from being easy.

I think I need to repeat here that, in the Eastern Orthodox view, reunion means that the English and American Episcopalian parishes in Russia and the East and the Eastern parishes and communities in Britain, the British Dominions and America, join the local dioceses. In principle there ought to be one bishop in each place or area under normal conditions. Variations in rites and ceremonies in a bishopric should not be such that they prevent one bishop from ruling over the whole body of the Church or prevent priests of different rites from receiving the Eucharist at the same liturgy, under the same bishop, as co-ministers with him. This is, in the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, " a full and free exchange of ministries and sacraments." Among the ministries to be fully and freely exchanged is the ministry of dogmatic teaching. Therefore there must be dogmatic agreement. It is possible, for the sake of argument, to conceive dogmatic agreement among Christians without any creeds at all and without any modifications in Church order. All might agree that Creeds and Particular Types of Ministry are not essential. Every one would then receive doctrinal teaching on those lines. The Creeds would come to be regarded as statements of the opinions of schools of thought and the episcopate would be regarded as a non-essential institution. That would be dogmatic agreement in the true sense of the expression, just as much as common agreement to accept papal infallibility would be dogmatic agreement. To say that the Eastern Orthodox, in requiring dogmatic agreement, are asking for what is impossible is simply to misunderstand the

argument. To say that we can never agree with some of the doctrines which they consider to be dogmas is another matter.

Most Orthodox theologians would deny that their Church has, or can ever have, any dogmatic definitions which do not rest on a basis in Holy Scripture. They would not separate Holy Tradition from the traditional interpretation of Holy Scripture. They would insist that a novel dogma is an impossibility. All revealed truth is both in the New Testament revelation and implicit in the teaching of the Church where the Church is Orthodox. But neither is Holy Scripture self-explanatory nor are the conciliar definitions self-explanatory. The Holy Spirit is teaching the Church what they mean and may still lead the Church to further declarations on the subject. It must be remembered that *the Church* means the whole Church, although the episcopate is the authoritative organ of the Church. Particular bishops, or even the majority of the bishops, may be led into heresy. This is not a doctrine of the oracular infallibility of an assembly of men. It is the doctrine that there will always be an Orthodox Church.

The Easterns would generally tend to say that since the separation of East and West, Orthodoxy is in the East alone. They would not, however, require a Western Church to adopt that view unreservedly, if that Church came to a common mind with the East on the other issues of doctrinal Orthodoxy. It would be quite possible to take the view that the Anglicans and the Old Catholics, between their respective separations from Rome and their union with the Orthodox East, had really withdrawn their support from the Western charges of heresy against the East and were thus free from the condemnation pronounced by the East against the West in the medieval period.

Even in relation to Roman Catholicism it has been said by Eastern Orthodox theologians that a settlement of differences by mutual explanation could not be ruled out if Rome would adopt that method of approach and would not insist on the dogmatic definitions made in the West, after the separation, to which the East had never assented. But the Easterns could not make the suggestion that papal infallibility should remain *de fide* in the West if not insisted upon in the East. Nor could they allow that the Filioque clause should be treated as part of the Creed in the West unless the Eastern Church could declare herself to be in full agreement with it, as she could only if the dogmatic definition of its meaning in the Council of Florence was withdrawn and replaced by another explanation which gave full value to the Eastern Trinitarian doctrine. Similarly neither the Council of Trent nor the 39 Articles nor the Protestant Confessions of the continent of Europe could keep the standing of an obligatory document in some particular part of the Church reunited with the Eastern Orthodox unless the Eastern Orthodox could give their assent to the doctrines involved.

Insufficient attention is given to the fact that the Orthodox Eastern Confessions of the seventeenth century which, in one sense, correspond to the 39 Articles, are not so much as mentioned in any formulary which Orthodox bishops and clergy have to sign. These are votes of local synods and therefore, while theologians give them a certain authority as com-

mentaries on the dogmatic definitions of the Church, they have not a fully obligatory position. What corresponds to the 39 Articles and the sixteenth century confessions in Orthodoxy is the consensus Patrum and the seven Ecumenical Synods. The Easterns are not asking the West to adopt anything distinctively Eastern, but only to go back, as far as obligatory definitions go, to the *status quo ante bellum*. Anglicans may wish to go even farther back, eliminating the idea of the consensus Patrum and certain of the definitions of the seven Ecumenical Councils. Or they may distrust the whole conception of obligatory dogmatic definition and dispute the idea that there was a *status quo ante bellum*. The Church has always been more or less divided and more or less corrupt in the opinion of some Anglicans. But the Orthodox position should be recognized as what it is on this point.

Nor should we forget that, to many of the Orthodox, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism and Anglicanism appear to be varieties of the same kind of thing. One sees this with special clearness in Greece where the Latin or Roman Church and the Greek Evangelical Church, which is Presbyterian in order, are small minorities, consisting very largely of people under foreign, Western European, influence. Some of the Latins are descendants of Italian and French and Spanish people who settled in Greece long ago. Some of the Protestants are Greeks who spent years in America and married in America and returned with their wives and children to spread what seems to them to be the pure Gospel they learned in the West. The Greek Uniats are converts to Roman Catholicism or children of converts. Under the rule of the Turks the Uniats were under the civil protection of the French consuls, while the Evangelicals or Protestants were always inclined to be under the protection of the American missionary colleges and even of the American and German consuls. They were given a civil status, as a ' nation ' or ' millet ' of Protestants of various nationalities, under a clergyman who was the " Protestant Patriarch " from the Turkish standpoint, owing to the diplomatic activities of England and Germany on their behalf. In Turkey at that period many civil matters were administered through the religious communities, and every man had to belong to a recognized church or synagogue if he was not a Moslem Turk. The Greeks, who were under Turkish rule, within living memory are inclined to think of any non-Orthodox as not really a Greek. Similarly in Russia before the revolution a Roman Catholic Russian was virtually a Pole rather than a Russian. A Baptist or any member of a sect which had a Western Protestant background seemed a German or an Englishman rather than a Russian, although there were many native Russian sects which were thoroughly Russian. These native sects have little in common with Protestantism. There is one small native sect in Greece of recent origin similar in many ways to the Russian Old Believers. Their idea is that they are the only true Orthodox, as the Greek Church by its official representatives, has fallen in a heresy by adopting the New Style Calendar and having friendly relations with Churches which are heretical. They denounce the ' kakodoxy ' of the university professors of theology and of the bishops, who are said to be selling Orthodoxy for gold and honours. On

the occasions when I met them they seemed to see no difference at all between the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury. The aim of the whole reunion movement seemed to them to be the absorption of the Greek Church and the Greek nation in a Western Christendom which was full of idolatry and all evil and had rejected the Gospel centuries ago. The popular name for the Western Christians in Greece is the 'Franks,' a name which reminds us of the Crusaders, and has a bad meaning.

The Frankocracy or government of the Franks means the rule of the various Crusader-princes and the Venetians and the Genoese, which lasted in many parts of Greece and the Greek islands from the sack of Constantinople in 1204 until the Turkish conquest. Similarly the Russians have suffered under the government of the Poles and the Serbs and Rumanians under the government of the Austria-Hungarian Empire. Roman Catholicism (and Western Christianity in general) is associated with minorities of foreign culture which are potential agents of the enemies and oppressors of the Orthodox nations. The expression "The Union of the Churches" has an association with Uniat Churches in communion with Rome which have submitted to Roman jurisdictional supremacy. Nor should it be left out of our thinking on this point that France and England were on the side of Turkey during the nineteenth century, while the Serbs and Bulgarians and Rumanians were obtaining their freedom. The Greeks were, in some stages in the process of the carving up of the Old Turkey, hostile enough to Russian ambitions in Macedonia to wish to support Turkey against Russians and Bulgars. Thus the Greeks kept a friendly attitude to the Western powers. But it was to Russia and to their own efforts that the Balkan nations felt that they owed their freedom before 1917. The Western Christians in Turkey were inclined to be passive in the struggle for freedom. The Western Christian minorities in Yugoslavia and Rumania have been inclined to be disruptive owing to their German and Italian and Hungarian associations. At least these accusations have constantly been made however unfairly. The Orthodox minority in Poland after the first world war had to suffer from the corresponding Polish suspicion that any one who is not a Roman Catholic cannot be really loyal to Poland. The Russian refugees in Central Europe and in the West have been suspected and have developed a certain refugee mentality. Even the most anti-Bolshevik Russian can feel anti-Western. Even an Orthodox in the U.S.A. or Canada who seems superficially very much Westernized can feel very strongly that he and his children must, at all costs, belong to Eastern Orthodox Christianity and not to the alien creeds of the Western European peoples. It is the business of Russian diplomacy under any regime to exploit this antagonism. It is not our business to increase it by suggesting, as some have suggested, that Eastern Orthodoxy is always more subservient to the State than any form of Western Christianity or that the Orthodox idea of the truth of the Church is really a return to the primitive herd-mentality. This kind of statement is a grotesque over-simplification if not without some grains of truth.

The Eastern Orthodox theologians if they want to develop some friendly relationships with the theologians of other confessions must explain what

they are doing to their bishops and, still more, to the Orthodox laity. There are two distinct Orthodox approaches to the Ecumenical Movement. One is to say to the laity and to all concerned that the aim is to be like a missionary. The Middle Ages saw many visits of Western theologians to the East, partly because the emperors of the East were more ready than the bishops of the East to think about reunion, and partly because the Western Christians living in the East had enough political power behind them to be a strong community. In more recent centuries both Roman Catholics and Protestants have had an extensive missionary work in the Near East under Turkey, and in other parts of the Orthodox world. But the Orthodox-Eastern point of view was not made known in the West. This was not entirely due to the passivity and supineness of the Eastern Christians. It was partly due to the lack of religious freedom in the West until modern times. It is not (for the Easterns) the right policy to have missions for individual conversions to particular Orthodox national Churches. But Orthodoxy can do something to make the Orthodox faith known and they hope that the Holy Spirit will make use of this work. This has very generally in recent years been the Russian point of view. It has been complicated by the emergence of a generation of Russian exiles who have not the intention of going back to Russia and who speak French, or English, or German, better than they speak Russian but who, in a large number of cases, are still convinced Orthodox. There are also in France and the U.S.A., for example, many French and American Orthodox of Lebanese and Syrian origin or of Greek origin; other displaced persons from Eastern Europe become French or American by nationality without necessarily becoming Roman Catholic or Protestant. It is the natural result that there should be experiments and movements in the direction of an Orthodox Church of France and an Orthodox Church of America and Canada, which may in time be an autocephalous Church, or may even think of becoming the Orthodox Western Patriarchate. The Old Catholics and the Anglo-Catholics have sometimes been regarded by Orthodox theologians as precursors of such a Western Orthodoxy. This approach to the West is what I may call the " Higher Orthodox " approach.

The other thing that can be done is to say that it is necessary to be a realist. Dogmatic discussions have gone on for centuries quite fruitlessly. The Westerns can proselytize far more effectively than the Easterns can ever hope to do, so that the very notion of proselytism ought, from the Eastern standpoint, to be condemned. The right thing to do is to be friendly with the Roman Catholics and Protestants in the spirit in which it is possible to be friendly with Jews and Moslems and Agnostics of goodwill who respect our convictions about religion. It is difficult to develop this relationship with the Latins because of their proselytizing tendencies and their seeming lack of respect for other religions. But it is possible for the Orthodox and Protestant nations to be allied against the evils of our time and for theologians and Churchmen to foster that alliance. It is possible for meetings between Orthodox and Protestants to include common prayer. But it is wiser not to discuss any questions of theological dogma. Intercommunion cannot be considered to be in any

A F E T Y A F I L M

foreseeable future a practicable step. The Orthodox who emigrates to America or Canada and his children will very often become Protestant. It is better that he should do so in some Church or sect which has friendly relations with the Orthodox. Possibly he may become Orthodox again if he returns to the East. So it is better that he should become Anglican than that he should be an Ikonoklastic Puritan Evangelical. All religions should co-operate against Atheism, the drink traffic, drugs, and other commonly recognized evils. This is what I may call the " Lower Orthodox " approach to the Western Churches. The two approaches are not necessarily completely incompatible. Nor is the " Lower " approach exclusively Greek. But lately the Russian criticism of the World Council of Churches has been that it is not concerned exclusively with the discussion of dogmatic theology. The Russians stated that they would take part in the discussion of questions of Faith and Order, but not in the consideration of questions of practical co-operation between the Orthodox and the Protestants. The Greek criticism, on the other hand, is that dogmatic theology is not excluded from the agenda. The Greeks say that dogma is, for them, outside all debate and discussion; to discuss it is to doubt it. They can only send ' observers ' to theological conferences and these may simply state the Orthodox point of view. But the Greeks will consider questions of practical co-operation with the Protestants in conferences of " Life and Work " devoted to practical and social and political issues. Some of the exiled Russians and Serbs agree with the Greeks.

It is clear, of course, that the Russians do not mean by the discussion of faith and order anything very different from what the Greeks mean by the making of a statement of the Orthodox point of view to a conference on issues of faith and order. Neither Russians nor Greeks can contemplate an alteration of the Orthodox position on dogmatic questions. Both Russians and Greeks from time to time indicate willingness to have theological discussions between Orthodox theologians and theologians of the Old Catholic and Anglican Communions.

Practical co-operation does not mean intercommunion except to a very limited extent in practice. Certainly it does not mean that synods of Orthodox bishops will sanction intercommunion or that the Orthodox will cease to build up an Orthodox Church for their emigrants distinct from the Anglican and Protestant Churches in Anglican dioceses. It means the discouragement of proselytism and a friendly attitude and a kind of political alliance against such common enemies as Communism, the wilder types of Protestant sects like Jehovah's Witnesses, and the powers of evil in general. I suspect that in the nineteenth century the idea of an alliance against Rome entered the picture less than we very often suppose. But of course it was present in the picture. The alliance with Rome against the Communists is present in the picture now among Greeks, various exiles from the Russian sphere of influence, and Orthodox of all national origins in the U.S.A. and Canada.

There are, however, those who dread " entangling alliances." Against the Marxist criticisms of religion we are not defending religion as an abstract idea. We are all defending particular religions against particular

criticisms. Nor are we all defending the same things. Some forms of the "Social Gospel," which make Christianity entirely a matter of the improvement of this world in a kingdom of God on earth are with the Communists in their main criticisms of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox positions. The first Communist attack is against paid clergy, belief in the future life, and belief in miracles. Medical and educational missionaries in China, concentrating on social work of a generally philanthropic kind, not believing in miracles, fighting the local form of belief in a future life, and possibly putting their belief in the future life in a subordinate position in their preaching, may find themselves on good terms with the Chinese Communists. At least so I heard lately from one who is in contact with Roman Catholic missions in China. On the other hand, the Christian Church which has become so firmly associated with Western Europe that it cannot function except with detailed orders from Western Europe, is entangled with the political opposition to Russian influence. It is hard for the Orthodox Russian Church to function in Europe west of the Iron Curtain under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch Alexis of Moscow. It is difficult for the Roman Catholic Church to function in Eastern Europe, beyond the Iron Curtain, under the jurisdiction of Pope Pius XII of Rome. The jurisdiction of Moscow is *jure ecclesiastico*. Many Russians, following precedents in Orthodox Church history, have repudiated it, either by repudiating the Patriarch outright or by simply claiming autonomy for their diocese and seeking recognition by the Greek Patriarchates. But the jurisdiction of Rome is *jure divino*. Whoever rules Rome, *de facto*, be it the Soviets or the Anglo-American bloc, can, as long as the Papacy remains in the Vatican City, give the impression, however wrongly, that he exercises pressure upon all Roman Catholics all over the earth. If the Papacy leaves Rome in the event of a Russian approach, this impression inevitably becomes strong in relation to the place to which the Papal Curia goes. If Roman Catholicism is associated in the Eastern European mind with Croats, Italians, Levantines, Poles, and Austrians, Protestantism is even more identified with Prussians and Americans. Is it sensible or wise to let the ether carry a statement that the part of the Orthodox Church which is on this side of the Iron Curtain is co-operating closely with American organizations? It is not an answer that the Russian Patriarch is co-operating with the Soviet government, whether willingly or unwillingly. In fact it is very probable indeed that, in the event of war (although the West would win), Greece and Turkey and most of the Middle East would endure a Russian occupation, whether long or short. The traditional role of the Church in foreign occupations in that part of the world has to be remembered. The Church has saved liberty but by "stooping to conquer" and by a traditional Eastern technique of patience.

I therefore anticipate that the participation of the Orthodox in Life and Work will not be general or wholehearted and that it may be complicated if Life and Work come to seem political. In Faith and Order on the other hand, those Russians abroad in Western Europe who do co-operate will co-operate heartily and with zeal and may gradually get Greeks to co-operate also, but they will be most careful to express themselves in such a

way that they cannot possibly be accused of making any compromise over doctrinal issues. It seems to me to be rather a pity that theologians should not participate independently of the question whether their Churches are members of the Council. Possibly, if one Orthodox local Church, such as the Patriarchate of Constantinople, is a member of the World Council, this can continue, as Orthodox theologians will co-operate as guests or assistants of the people from Constantinople. Sooner or later there will be a local Orthodox Church of America which will co-operate. Possibly in the rest of the Western world the Orthodox will come to see their communities in terms of their Orthodox faith rather than in terms of their various Eastern national origins. The Orthodox of all national origins in continental Western Europe may form a Church. Here what I have called the 'Higher' approach is bound to predominate. The Orthodox in retaining his faith under Western social conditions will inevitably insist upon it more and there already are cases of conversion to Orthodoxy from Romanism and Lutheranism and Calvinism.

Something ought here to be said about the Orthodox use of the term 'Economy,' as it is often discussed among Anglicans. The first idea we have to grasp is that the sacraments are believed to be like rays of a single sun. They communicate to people one grace, the operation of God, although they do so in various ways. Thus one sacrament can, as it were, replace another. On one occasion the Russian Holy Synod was informed that a certain Russian priest had never been baptized and confirmed. He had received the Eucharist and ordination and had administered the sacraments and received them in the mistaken belief that he had been baptized and confirmed in his infancy. The Russian Holy Synod did *not* baptize and confirm him and reordain him, treating his ordination as invalid. That is what the Roman Catholic Church does in a like case. They exercised Economy and declared, in a synodical act, that he had received the grace of baptism and confirmation in receiving the other sacraments, the Eucharist especially. By a similar act of Economy, a bishop or priest or deacon of a non-Orthodox Church who wishes to unite himself with the Orthodox Church is, very often, sacramentally absolved by the Orthodox bishop after confession and then given the Holy Eucharist, in the way in which it is administered to priests and other clergy, at the Eucharist celebrated by the Orthodox bishop. The cleric newly reunited or united with the body of the Orthodox diocese is said to 'con-celebrate' with the Orthodox bishop who, by an act of Economy, declares him to be an Orthodox cleric, in what is called his "existing rank." This is not done except when the cleric so united to Orthodoxy comes from a Church in which there are bishops, priests and deacons and in which the Apostolic Succession is preserved. The bishops are consecrated by bishops and this has been the practice ever since the separation between the Church concerned and the Orthodox Church. But the Economy involved does not in any way imply that the Church from which clerics enter the Orthodox fold "without reordination" is treated as a branch of the Orthodox Church or as a Church which has the same rights. In fact no Church can be said to have the 'right' to have her clerics received "in their existing orders"; it

is not a matter of right at all. It is, in legal language, a matter of grace. The Orthodox bishop may reordain any cleric from a non-Orthodox Church who wants to be an Orthodox priest; he may even rebaptize with the Orthodox rite of baptism any one baptized in another confession who wants to be confirmed and to be a communicant in the Orthodox Church. The rebaptism or reordination will not be considered as sacrilege, for non-Orthodox sacraments are not considered to be *per se* valid. This is the principal use of the term Economy in connection with the questions relating to the validity of the sacraments. A quite secondary use is the use of the term to describe what happens when in fact, contrary to the regular rule of the Church, Orthodox parents have their child baptized by an Anglican priest, or Orthodox couples are married by an Anglican priest, or Orthodox laity receive the Holy Eucharist from Anglicans, or Orthodox clergy administer any of the various sacraments to an Anglican, or to a member of a Separated Eastern Church. The use of the term Economy in connection with such irregularities implies that they are irregularities but not instances of pure lawlessness. The letter of the law gives way to the spirit of the law. The Orthodox bishop could excommunicate the Orthodox concerned but, "making use of Economy," he does not do so. Here again, as with the primary use of the term, it is really presupposed that all the sacraments, including the sacraments of the heterodox communities involved, are capable of being thought about as rays of the same sun. One may replace another in some special circumstances. It is when an Anglican lay-person cannot possibly, for physical reasons, receive the Anglican sacraments, or when a Copt is in a country where there is no Coptic Church at all, or when an Orthodox is similarly out of reach of the Orthodox Church's sacraments, that these irregularities are treated as instances of 'Economy' and not blamed as pure lawlessness. Thus at Conferences of the Fellowship of S. Alban & S. Sergius we have never had intercommunion between Anglicans and Orthodox, as priests of both communions at present. When I was a student at the Greek seminary at Halki I did not make my communion there, as the Anglican church in Istanbul was available within easy reach. Instances of intercommunion seem to be decreasing rather than multiplying in the U.S.A. As there are more Orthodox clergy in America than before and parishes are better organized, there is less need of Anglican ministrations among the Orthodox.

At present the Orthodox in the Western world, being exiles, have their minds concentrated on the problems of their home Churches. The Greeks fear Russian criticism very naturally. No one wants to take unilateral action. Also, the Orthodox face the possibility of being identified, through identification with the Anglican Communion, with the whole mass of other bodies in the Ecumenical Movement, in which Anglicans play such a great part. Thus in some of the Greek theological criticisms of the Amsterdam Conference I come across "The Anglican Branch Theory." This theory is that no Church is Catholic and every communion which carries the name of Christian has part of the truth. According to the Orthodox that implies that all communions are heretical and all Christians are heretics. They willingly admit that they are morally and intellectually defective and that

they can be very unpleasant people who talk too much. But, like the Abbot Agathon of my first lecture, they will not admit that they are heretics and they think there is something wrong with the position of people who say, "We are heretics and so is every one else." I am not saying that Anglicans do say this. But they are inclined to give this impression. If Orthodoxy seems hidden in a mystical oriental glow, *Ecclesia Anglicana* appears wrapped in a London fog.

The propagandist efforts of some of the minor sects of America are still a problem to the Orthodox in the Near East and Orthodox exiles in the West. These sects have a very comprehensible tendency to be attracted to Bible lands and to people who come from Bible lands. Jehovah's Witnesses, I believe, have a considerable amount of their literature translated into Armenian, besides a good deal of work among Greeks. They seem to have a certain amount of success, although it is probably not often a lasting success, among uneducated people. These sects, and Protestants in general, have a tendency to claim that their religion is the religion of the most enlightened people in the British and American nations.

The existence of other kinds of Protestantism is of course well known to better-educated clergy and lay theologians. But in those circles there is a tendency to confuse the more scholarly type of Protestantism with rationalism. Many Greek intellectuals return from university studies in Germany convinced that it is impossible for any educated man to be a Christian and popularize the works of men like Renan. German universities are associated with a somewhat crude evolutionary materialism. America also seems to produce in the minds of Greeks who go there and come back again the idea that any kind of supernatural Christianity must be unfit for the twentieth century. Therefore the defenders of Orthodoxy, while often interested in the works of individual Roman Catholic and Protestant scholars and especially in those who write apologetic treatises, are apt to see in Protestantism the roots of scepticism. The Roman Catholic claims tend to be regarded as irrelevant to the present battle against atheism and as disruptive in their actual practical effect in Eastern Christendom, in so far as they demand the conversion of individuals to the Roman Obedience. But there are signs of much better feeling than used to be prevalent between Roman Catholics and Orthodox on the Western side of the Iron Curtain.

If in the nineteenth century there was some inclination in the countries liberated from the Turkish Empire and in Russia to look to Western Europe with an admiring eye and to hope for an assimilation with Western Europe in religion, as in everything else, two wars have very much weakened that inclination. The Orthodox Church has gained to some extent from the revival of cultural and social nationalism and greater interest in the history of the Byzantine period. Greece, as well as Russia, has a sense of an unfulfilled mission to the world. And it is inevitable that it should seem to the Orthodox that the Church is united in the East, where the Protestants and Roman Catholics are insignificant minorities, and where the separated Eastern Churches are confined to a few areas. The sects, of Eastern origin, are not a significant factor, with

the possible exception of the Old Believers in Russia. Orthodoxy can seem, in each of the Balkan States at least, to be the One Christian Church, as far as the country is concerned, and can in that way be contrasted with the several competing Churches in Britain, or America, or Germany.

Τὰ δόγματα τῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἡμῶν ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐγαει τηρήσειν ἀκέραια καὶ ἀκιβδηλα, ταῖς θείαις γράφαῖς αὐτῶ τε ἱερῷ εὐαγγελίῳ καί ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων διδασκαλίαις καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἑπτὰ δέ οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων θεσπισμασιν ἀπαρατρέπτως ἑπόμενός καὶ μηδὲν τούτοις ἀντίδοξον μηδ' απηχές μηδ' ἀλλότριον μηδ' ἑτέρους διδάξαι μηδ' αυτός ἀποδέξασθαι.

Oath of all Doctors of Theology in the University of Athens. (From Bratsiotes, *Authority and Freedom in Orthodox Theology* (1931).)

SOME ASPECTS OF THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE OR 'HESYCHIA' ACCORDING TO ST. GREGORY PALAMAS

INTRODUCTION

THE term Mysticism, *vita contemplativa,* has not the same meaning for all who have treated of it. It has been used with the greatest elasticity according to individual idiosyncracies of interpretation. Generally speaking, many hold that mysticism expresses a strongly religious communion and union with God: future happiness through the Beatific Vision being capable of enjoyment while still in this life. The mystics have always known and maintained the inaccessibility and incomprehensibility of God and of His essence: nevertheless the movement towards God and the desire for the vision and knowledge of Him are stronger in the souls of the saints of God. This vision is a necessity of the human spirit. After all, "the Divinity is such because the word 'God' is attributed to Him."[1] God Himself created His contemplator.[2] The Beatitude "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" refers to the future. Through "*deifying Grace*"[3] and divine illumination, the saints live the true life and see God from now onwards.[4] If we assume that mysticism has this meaning, can we say that there are mystical tendencies in the Greek Orthodox Church? Many deny that there are these elements of mysticism. They come to this conclusion from the very meaning of the title Orthodox applied to the Church as maintaining right dogma and right faith. Rationalizing and the elaborating of the content of the Faith characterizes, they say, the Fathers and writers of the Eastern Church. From this arise, as is well known, the doctrinal conflicts and the Ecumenical Councils. Others hold the same view, maintaining that the theology and religious life of the Eastern Church which is characteristic of her, has its ground in its development from the Hellenic environment and from people influenced by Greek culture. But Greek culture is rationalistic and ruled by the νοῦς: consequently the Eastern Church under this influence has emphasized the theoretical element rather than the mystical.

[1] Nikephoros Kataphygitiós. Migne (P.G.) 147, 852.
[2] *Ibid.*, 147, 853.
[3] *Ibid.*, E.II 151, 680.
[4] *Ibid.*, E.II 34, 461.

These ideas are the outcome of the well-known theory of Harnack, Hatch and others that primitive Christianity degenerated as soon as its climate was changed and transplanted into a Greco-Roman environment. But nothing of this really took place. The Greek environment could no more change or influence what is divine in the Christian religion than it could change or influence God or Christ. Christianity used only the types and methods of expression of Greek thought. On the contrary, it is an undeniable historical fact "that Christianity has christianized the Hellenic civilization of Greco-Roman society." [5] In these mystical dispositions and tendencies in the Eastern Church must be sought the reason why Plato and Plotinus, those idealistic and mystical philosophers, have more influence on the language and ideas of the Greek Fathers than the rationalizing Aristotle, who was followed by the Scholastics of the West, who maintained that the Platonic theories with reference to 'ideas' are empty words and poetic metaphors.[6] The quarrel of Palamas with Barlaam and his followers of the West was a quarrel between mystics and Platonists on the one hand and Aristotelian theologians and rationalists on the other.[7] Eventually Palamas had the upper hand because he expressed the tradition and belief of the Eastern Church on the questions of the knowledge of God and communion with Him, and on the contemplative life and Hesychia. The Eastern Orthodox Church is strongly mystical in both her theology and her life. She has nourished and developed in many ways the contemplative and inner life, the life of prayer, and the heavenly visions of her children. The supernatural element dominates in all things to such an extent that one of her Fathers says, "To remember God is more the element of the Christian than to breathe." [8] The divine worship of the Eastern Church in symbols and symbolic acts, her wonderful hymns and the moving prayer of the Divine Liturgy and of other Offices, the wide development of the ascetical life within and outside society, the impressive piety of the authors of patristic works, the cloud of her saints and martyrs —all these witness to her supernatural tendencies and her theocentric life. The Divinity fills her everywhere and always, since He has churches and places of worship in every corner of the world, and every day is dedicated by them to the remembrance of the saints who were pleasing to God. Some who are outside the Church criticize the above-mentioned as merely external forms and ceremonialism; but they do so because they look only on the external forms and symbols and not on what they signify; as Gregory Palamas himself expresses it, "Those who typify and express and search out the divine and the spiritual through bodily symbols." [9] The con-

[5] We do not think tenable the hypothesis of some that the independence of Greek philosophy discernible in the Cappadocian Fathers derives from the fact that the political theory and traditions had a Persian provenance and were not of Greek origin. Their mysticism and independence can be explained by their genius, and the divine powers of their Christian faith. See A. Armstrong, "Nature and Grace," *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, Vol. 8, 1949.

[6] Arist. Metaphr., 991 a 21, "to speak emptily can also mean to speak in poetic metaphors."

[7] This view has the support both of Theodore Ouspentoke in his book on *Byzantine Paideia* (Petrograd, 1892, pp. 273ff.), and Archimandrite Cyprian Kern in his article "Les éléments de la théologie de Grégoire Palamas" in *Irénikon*, 1947.

[8] Gregory Theologos, Migne E.II 151, 573.

[9] Migne E.II 150, 1116.

templative life could never be understood unless it was accompanied by piety; and it was maintained that it could not be realized save through the exercise of righteousness and the purification of the soul from every evil committed by it.

It has been a maxim of the Eastern Church that "the act (πράξις) is the ascent to contemplation (θεωρία)," [10] that is to say that the act is the ladder by which one ascends to the contemplative life. Gregory Theologos denounced those who were hasty and inexperienced; in undertaking the discussion of theological matters he says "I praise not those who enter without preparation into the debates of God. It is a dreadful fault, since we must purify ourselves and only then have dealings with Him who is pure." [11] The development of a strong mysticism, that is, the life of prayer and ἄσκησις did not take place in the Eastern Church to the detriment of the practical life of piety, but πράξις and θεωρία were maintained in the closest association as mutually necessary for human perfection.

One form of mysticism is Hesychia or the hesychast life, which the hesychasts identify with the contemplative life. Hesychia is a way of perfection for the individual ever since monasticism was established in the Eastern Church: in other words since the time that the first anchorites' cells appeared. Hesychia was recognized and greatly honoured in the Eastern Church as a way of perfection for those human beings who have developed their mystical tendencies. Many saints and Fathers of the Church belong to the hesychast type, and have lived in quiet contemplation far from the world and have afterwards become famous for the triumphs of their sanctity.

One of these is St. Gregory Palamas, who not only systematically exercised Hesychia, but also practised it throughout his life, and especially as Archbishop of Thessalonika, showing the same zeal in his pastoral activities as a monk following the contemplative life on Mount Athos. St. Basil of Caesarea, St. Gregory Nazianzen and many other saints of the Church are examples of the same way of life. Contemplative preoccupation could not prevent them from working in the midst of the world. Hesychia does not differ from mysticism, since it is also mysticism, except for the fact that it is practised far from the world, gives the first place to prayer, that is, to uninterrupted conversation with God and the vision of God above any other spiritual activity. Good works, according to the hesychasts, are necessary for the rendering of the soul receptive of divine grace, but they do not unite us with God. Prayer is the sole link between God and His creatures. The Orthodox Church having advocated Hesychia, recommends and acknowledges the invaluable significance of prayer, the prayer-life and unceasing communion with God. "Intercourse through the exercise of virtue prepares the ascetic for receptivity of the divine, but not for union," says Gregory Palamas. "But the power of prayer sanctifies it and perfects the lifting up of men towards divine union, since it is the link between the contemplating creature and the Creator." [12] This emphasis

[10] Gregory Theologos. Migne E.II 35, 1089.
[11] *Ibid.*, 35, 1069; 35, 1089.
[12] Migne 150, 1117.

on prayer is in accordance with Holy Scripture.[13] Cassian asks, "Is it not clear that Christ during his visit to Martha and Mary defines contemplation as the highest good for man? For this reason all the other virtues however valuable must take a secondary place being cultivated and possessed for the sake of one sole aim."[14] But let us now examine the basic features of Hesychia according to one of the most representative of its exponents in the Eastern Church, St. Gregory Palamas.[15]

I

It is necessary that man should live in perfect and unceasing communion with God through holy contemplation, seeing Him only. From this vision of blessedness he becomes divinized. Consequently the first step and the basic feature of the contemplative life is solitariness. Hesychia in the midst of worldly distractions is impossible. Those who maintain the contrary have not grasped what penetration into and absorption in the vision means. As Palamas says, "Not only separation from the world but also from association even with those of like mind, nay, even the sight of such is necessary, since such association impedes communion with God, and may even endanger the equilibrium of the hesychast."[16] What is emphasized here is the necessary continuity of communion with God. Life in God cannot be perfect when only certain hours are dedicated to God. In truth, the soul of man is not able to live without God, even for an instant, in that from the very moment that this link is severed, the soul, would die and no longer exist. As the body without the soul is dead and without it cannot live for the smallest division of time, so the soul without God is dead. "Christ called 'dead' all those who did not follow Him[17] and said 'Let the dead bury their dead.'" Now the ascetic has closed all his senses against worldly influences, since we can only reach our true selves and God when our senses are shut off. "Being thus free from outer influences from the world, we come to our very selves, and see at last the kingdom of God within us."[18] If the contemplative has to live amongst others, he must

[13] Cf. K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God*, p. 203. "With all this, it can fairly be said that the monks made a great positive contribution to Christianity by allotting to prayer the primacy among Christian activities."

[14] Cass, Coll. 1, 8.

[15] The more important works dealing with Gregory Palamas are the following: —

(1) Greg. Papamichael (professor, Athens University), *St. Gregory Palamas* (Petrograd 1905, Alexandria 1911), a very complete (in Greek) exposition and analysis of the teaching and life of G. Palamas and the hesychast disputes of his time.

(2) Vladimir Lossky, "La théologie de la lumière chez St. Grégoire de Thessalonique." Article in *Dieu Vivant*, 1, 1945.

(3) The Monk Basil (Krivochin), "Die asketische und theologische Lehre des Hl. Gregorius Palamas (1296–1359)" in *Das östliche Christentum*, Würzburg, 1939.

(4) Archimandrite Cyprian Kern, "La Théologie de Grégoire Palamas" (*Irénikon*, xx, 1947.

(5) M. Jugie, "La controverse palamite" (*Echos d'Orient*, 1931).

(6) Dom Clement Lialine, O.S.B., "The theological teaching of Gregory Palamas on divine simplicity," *E.C.Q.*, Vol. VI, 5, 1946.

(7) Dr. Georg Wunderle, "zur Psychologie des Hesychastischen Gebetes," 1949, and by the same author "die Gotteschau im palamistischen Hesychasmus" (1948).

[16] Gr. Pal. Migne 150, 1044.

[17] Migne 150, 1049.

[18] Migne 151, 683. The hesychast says that the 'mystai' (from the verb to shut or close) say thus because "shutting off the senses and being outside fleshly thoughts, they received divine flashes of illumination."

live in such a way as not to be associated with the deceitfulness of the world. "Even the saints of our Lord," says Makarios, "can sit in theatres and watch the deceitfulnese of the world, and yet in their inner selves be in communion with God, however much they may be judged by those outside as mixed with worldly affairs." [19]

II

The second fundamental principle of Hesychia, closely similar to the first, is the turning inward of the mind towards self known as concentration (συνέλιξις), tight-closing on oneself (συστροφής), concentration on the centre (συννένευις), as the author of the works of Dionysios defines the cyclic movement of the νοῦς.[20] A completely integrated theory was developed by Palamas and other hesychasts on the movement of the νοῦς towards itself and the discipline of the thoughts. The hesychast, having driven himself away from the world, becomes invulnerable to its influences, but evil thoughts tending to seek expression remain as constant temptations and the enemy of contemplation. For this reason many became intensely concerned in disciplining their thoughts and in self-concentration on the νοῦς and God. Consequently their ideas on this matter were the outcome of this experience, of this struggle, in reaching contemplation and in succeeding in the realization of a continual unceasing life in God. The practical needs of the contemplative life gave rise to conceptions of this sort. From the furnace of ἄσκησις came the thought of the turning in contemplation of the νοῦς and God alone. Gregory Palamas, Gregory of Mount Sinai, Nicholas Cabasilas, Nilus Abbas and others became famous as profound students and analysers of the strong impulse towards divinization. Their findings and descriptions of this religious phenomenon of contemplation are very constructive. The first characteristic of Hesychia is separation from the world: the going-out. Yet in the desert, in solitude, the mind frequently turns to external and wordly things. To the monks of the desert evil thoughts constitute the greatest enemy. Thoughts proceed to actions; and as the thoughts are, so is the man. Naturally the mind partakes of the character of those things that it sees and thinks about. Gregory Palamas says, "The inward man took on his external form soon after the Fall." [21] So also says Nikephoros Kataphygiotes, "That which the mind has seen is what it is most influenced by, and to what it approximates." [22] We need therefore to be continually on our guard with reference to the mind, which is, according to Palamas, the most agile part of us.[23] This characteristic of the mobility of the mind, capable of moving hither and thither in its excursions into the world has drawn the attention of the hesychasts. For this reason, great significance is attached to the return of the mind to the inner world and centre of its being, and from

[19] Makarios. Sermons 15, 8. Migne 34, 581.
[20] Migne 150, 1109 and 1120.
[21] Migne 150, 1122.
[22] Migne 147, 852. Cf. the similar expression of the Western mystic Ruysbroek "What we are, that we behold; and what we behold, that we are." Dean Inge, *Christian Mysticism*.
[23] Migne 150, 1109.

thence to God. So essential was this return movement considered to be that Palamas actually defines Hesychia as the return of the mind to the centre of being, and makes this the point at which the divine power intervenes to operate. These very ideas Palamas repeats and develops in all his treatises, and especially in his sermon "*De iis qui sacrae indulgent quietudini.*"[24] He wrote this to refute the arguments of those who claimed that we must turn the mind outwards and not inwards, since the body is not the worthy dwelling-place of the mind; and also because they could not reconcile how the mind, which is already within us and not separate from the soul, can be reintroduced into ourselves. Palamas made the following answer to this: The ascetic fights to oust the law of sin and in its place to establish the law of the spirit (Rom. vii. 23), or according to the hesychast, the supervision of the mind operating according to the divine law upon all the spiritual and bodily powers. By this dominion of the mind we govern all the activities of body and spirit. As regards the senses, we restrict them to certain limits of knowing and feeling. This restrictive activity is called ἐγκράτεια or temperance. In the affective part of the soul we put ἀγάπη. The contemplative region of the soul is strengthened by the taking away of every thought that prevents its being lifted up to God. This activity is called νήψις or purified awareness. Temperance, love and purified awareness (ἐγκράτεια ἀγάπη, νήψις) are the three practical means by which the hesychast prepares his heart to be receptive to the writing upon it of the divine law, and by continual prayer to partake of divine grace and light. Temperance is the foundation of every moral activity, since without self-mastery it is impossible to appropriate any virtue. Love is the highest commandment and the root of all virtues, making us Godlike, in that He Himself is love (1 John iv. 8). Purified awareness, the wide-awake condition of the soul, is the careful watching of every movement of spirit and body, and as such is the basic characteristic of the ascetic. For this reason many of them are called *neptics*. By these three characteristics and by prayer, the hesychast sees within himself the promised grace to the pure in heart.[25] Those living in ἡσυχία make a strict daily self-examination, bearing in mind that that same day they may come before the judgment-throne (1 Cor. ii. 31).

The seat of the mind according to some of the ancients is the brain, this being the citadel; but according to Palamas and other mystics, it is the heart (καρδία), since Christ said[26] "that from the heart thoughts proceed" (St. Matt. xv. 19). Palamas clearly says[27] that the mind is not imprisoned in the heart. This last is the inner room of the thoughts, the chief bodily organ and the visible instrument of the reasoning faculty. This assumption seems to be somewhat pietistic to-day,[28] simple and naïve: nevertheless it witnesses to the importance attributed by the ascetics (strict with themselves and with the worldly) to the emotional element of human personality, dominated by love for the deity and the supernatural. Later on in

[24] Migne 150, 1102.
[25] Migne 150, 1105.
[26] St. Matt. xv. 19.
[27] Here are omitted two lines, *vide* Migne 150, 1108.
[28] Cf. *Kirche und Cosmos, Orthodoxes und Evangelisches Christentum*, 1950, p. 130.

the philosophy of Pascal, the heart occupies a central position, but Pascal starts from theoretical permisses, from the truth that reason has its own limits and does not exhaust the being (*το ὄν*) and the knowledge of being. Therefore, he says, the heart (i.e. faith) has its own arguments that the reason cannot fathom.[29] In the philosophy of Pascal the heart has as important a place as the theory of knowledge in Kant, and as the theory of method in Descartes. Likewise for moral reasons, the heart with the hesychasts occupies an equally important place and is regarded as the centre of human personality. From experience, they became convinced that within the heart a moral battle is joined which determines the eternal destiny of man. Divine grace seeks to endorse in the heart the laws of the spirit, and in it to set up its throne.[30] The hesychasts seek to restore and rediscover reason in the very centre of the body which we call the heart. To those who asked how it is possible for the reason to do this, Palamas answers by the well-known Palamite distinction between substance (*οὐσία*) and energy (*ἐνέργεια*), between reason (*νοῦς*) and the energy of the reason (*ἡ τοῦ νοῦ ἐνέργεια*). He maintained that *νοῦς* is one thing and *ἐνέργεια* another. The *νοῦς* is not like the eye which cannot see itself, while being able to see what is visible. Returning to itself the *νοῦς* operates *per se* and is able to see itself perfectly clearly. These operations of reason are called reason by many, who therefore say that the indwelling reason cannot return within itself as long as we are concerned with the energies of reason and not with reason itself. St. Basil says, "Reason which is not deceived by outward things returns to itself and from itself to God." Palamas proves from other patristic quotations that reason returning to itself and operating by itself, with pain and labour restrains the tendency of thoughts to become scattered and wandering, and thus approaches intellectually to God and shares the unspeakable blessings of eternal life. As to the objections of those who regard the body as an unworthy instrument of reason (and on this ground recommend the extroversion of thoughts) Palamas states, relying on Pauline and other biblical quotations, that the body is God's temple and the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit, since it is purified from any fleshly inclination and from the inherited evil of the flesh.[31] Concerning the relationship between body and soul, Palamas has according to the Orthodox view dealt with the relationship between body and soul and between the soul and the material order in a wonderful essay devoted entirely to the subject and entitled "*Prosopopeia*."[32] This essay is one of the masterpieces of Christian literature. After taking into account the conceptions of body and soul in this treatise and the other Palamite doctrine of the *οὐσία* of God and His operations in divine grace or *ἡσυχία*, on the return of reason to itself (*ἐπιστροφὴς τοῦ νοῦ*), on the divinization of man (*Θέωσις*) one can without reservation include Palamas among the greatest of the Fathers of the Church and consider him as one of the philosophical geniuses of Orthodoxy.

[29] "Le cœur a ses raisons que la raison ne comprend pas."
[30] Migne 150, 1108.
[31] Migne 151, 228.
[32] Migne 150, 1347–1372.

In this treatise, after mentioning opinions of previous philosophical thought on the relationship between the reasoning part of the soul and its unreasoning receptivity, or between the outward and inward man according to the Pauline distinction (regarded by him as the only valid one), he proceeds to the description of a judgment. In this, the judges are anchorite monks, the prosecutor is the soul, the offender is the body, and the crimes are the various transgressions of men. The soul condemns the body as responsible, and as misleading it in the direction of evil; but the body, defending itself, throws all the responsibility on the soul. The soul, expressing its satisfaction in having ascetics as its judges, famous in the struggle against the body, and thus knowing the damage the body inflicts upon it, begins by mentioning its divine origin. But although of divine origin, for unknown reasons it was imprisoned in the body, probably lest it should become proud. Thus from its first day the soul is debased by the body, and in this co-existence with the body suffers with it before birth in the womb, at birth and afterwards. During the period after birth, the body having taken to itself powers inimical to the soul through material food, deceives the soul and leads it astray through gluttony, lust, surfeiting and greed. The natural law of nourishment and reproduction goes astray through the abuses of the body of every kind of evil. Meanwhile the soul struggles in vain to master the body and to impose its domination upon it, for the body disobeys its dictates and reacts and fights against the soul with all its powers. Perhaps the body would say that it is incumbent upon the soul to punish the body which is subordinated to it, and by floggings, as a proverb puts it, " To the ass, the stick and provender, but to the slave bread and the whip."

At what age, the soul may ask, should I master the body, since during my childhood from lack of experience and intelligence I commit many foolish acts, and in adolescence and maturity am not only disobedient but made prisoner and forced to co-operate? Neither the whip nor the rod, nor fire, is able to subordinate the body to the soul, although the soul says, I am sorry to take such measures against the body, since it is my companion, my colleague and my friend. Nor in old age can I do anything because the body is deprived of its strength and senses, while its members have become weak. All these disadvantages can be attributed to me, although I myself am deprived of the instruments of knowledge and I come to think and live as a foolish child.

Accordingly, instead of the enslaved body being led and driven by the soul, the body on the contrary subordinates the soul and forces it to behave in an unseemly way. The soul therefore demands that the judges pass a fair judgment on the guilty body, in order that it may be disciplined and thereafter live in harmony and be worthy of the promised blessedness. Against these accusations of the soul, the body makes this defence: That even it itself has divine origin, since it was created by its Maker, and in a miraculous way. " I have not been made," says the body, " with four feet on the ground, with head and belly earthwards, but stand erect on the small soles of my feet, with my head lifted on high towards the heavens and the heavenly beauties. If I make use of food and drink to support life,

this is not in any way evil, neither is it permissible for the soul to call food a luxury, just as it is not permissible for you, my judges, to become cooks and servers of tables because you enjoy food and take care of your bodies. With respect to the soul's accusation that I mislead it in the direction of wickedness and other abuses, I wonder how it cannot understand that it is blaming me for offences it commits itself. Why, while the soul claims to be in the divine image (as indeed it is), and queen of all creatures, does it allow me as ruler to mislead and misguide it, it being meantime led as a slave? How is it that every offence committed by both respectively is attributed to me alone? If the soul rules, and I am what it rules, why are its offences attributed to me? The Lord has appointed the soul a faithful steward of sustenance; nevertheless it does not faithfully fulfill the commission entrusted to it, nor exercise with prudence the office of governor and ruler of this present life. The soul blames my senses, says the body, calling them caves and precipices; but in so doing it is proved ungrateful for what is good and for that which it can only possess through them, since through the sense of hearing the soul learnt the science of numbers and harmony, through that of sight the analogy of numbers and geometry and astronomy, through that of touch and taste, medicine and all that concerns health. Through my senses the soul is able to hear the harmony of the universe, through the magnitude and beauty, the regular movement of creatures to see and wonder at the First Good, who is their supreme Creator. 'What is more precious than the finding of God through the phenomena of the senses?' [33]

"The soul blames me in vain being a rebel and disorderly, because I live and behave always in strict relation with the soul. If I could have a soul that is a friend of the good and of reason, then, I should pursue and follow artists, teachers and tutors: but if I should be destined to have a soul that is itself trained professionally then I learn and readily exercise the various techniques, however hard and painful they may be. I always suffer the consequences of a disorderly and moody soul; and because of its abuses I am at the mercy of disease, and bed-ridden. I suffer fever, my feet and hands are crippled with rheumatism and at the mercy of doctors who want to amputate them. All these things I suffer because of the soul, if it does not govern with prudence."

The monks who are the judges, relying on their own experience and Holy Writ, condemn the soul for exercising bad management in the commission entrusted to it by God, and for taking up a Manichaean attitude in attributing the evil in men to the soul, since the Manichaeans taught that the reasonable soul is the creation of God, but the unreasonable soul of an evil God.

We have dealt briefly with the doctrine of St. Gregory Palamas with reference to the personification of the body and the soul in order to show that the characteristic of Palamite mysticism is that the body is not the root of every evil and consequently rightly punishable, but is the temple of the Holy Ghost and the dwelling-place of God. Palamas, who has treated with such power the teaching of the Divine Light, could not do otherwise

[33] Migne 150, 1369.

than extend its effect on the material world, and stress the healthy and entirely sound doctrine that "those who have lifted the mind to God and set its desire on Him and through the transformed flesh become the equal partner of the Divine Nature, the property and dwelling-place of God, no longer have any hostility towards God and do not act against the spirit." [34]

The judges which constituted the Court were hesychasts. This means that the ascetics themselves pronounce the sentence that the body and the material order in general is not responsible for the evil in man and in society, but the soul and the reason of man; that the glory of the divinized soul is reflected in the body and the material order. The monks teach this, although many maintain that they are mistaken in their views about the body and matter generally. Rightly Georg Wunderle says, "The ideal of life in the Eastern Orthodox Church is paradisical, and the supernatural transfiguration of the earthly, the deification of man. The radiant secret of Easter is its strongest manifestation." [35]

BASIL IOANNIDES.

University of Salonika.

(Translated from the Greek by E.T. and A.O.)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

IN the last century in this country Orthodoxy has had the devotion and interest of many distinguished writers and scholars. Such names as Neale, Birkbeck, Athelstan Riley, Frere, Stephen Graham, reveals the richness of the harvest gathered, the high quality and distinction of the output. Is there, it may legitimately be asked, any book of these latter days that can compare with these people? If we have now no more expert knowledge than they had we probably understand more clearly the Orthodox mind and ways, and yet much of the fire and warmth as well as the enthusiasm of older days is departed. These reflections are deepened by reading afresh such a book as Stephen Graham's *Undiscovered Russia*.[1] It is an altogether delightful account of an adventure no longer possible, a pilgrimage on foot through the almost unknown provinces of Russia that lie between Archangel and Moscow. It is made the medium of an interpretation of the Russian peasant, and above all the Orthodox Russian peasant, that allowing for the mighty rivers and stormy torrents that have since swept Russia, must still be basically true. The book has exciting esoteric judgments of the role Russia and Russian Christianity has played and will play in the world, a kind of apocalyptic that can so easily issue in the high doctrines of Moscow the Third and Eternal Rome; but what attracts and moves one so powerfully is the warmth and Christian love of the book. You no longer wonder why, with such an advocate, Russia has in the past overshadowed

[34] Migne 150, 1113.
[35] Georg Wunderle, "Die religiöse Bedeutung der östkirchlichen Studien." Heft. 1, 3, 25, 1950.
[1] *Undiscovered Russia* by Stephen Graham. John Lane, The Bodley Head. 1912 (now out of print).

the conception of Orthodoxy in this country to the virtual exclusion of both Hellenic and Middle-Eastern interpretations.

In *Orthodoxia*, the official organ of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the March number announces the steps the Ecumenical Patriarchate has taken to reopen the project of a Pro-Synod of the Orthodox Church, originally convoked for the year 1932, and deferred in the first place owing to the disturbed conditions in certain autonomous Orthodox churches, and later through the general political conditions of Europe. The Holy Synod of Constantinople having decided to lay the matter again before the Orthodox Churches, an encyclical to the patriarchs and autocephalous heads of Orthodoxy has been dispatched by the Ecumenical Patriarch asking for their judgment on the matter. Such a pro-Synod would be the forerunner of an Ecumenical Synod. In 1930 an Inter-Orthodox Committee met at the monastery of Vatopedi on Mount Athos to discuss and prepare the agenda for the Pro-Synod and suggested that it should be held on Pentecost Sunday of 1932 at the same great monastery. The Ecumenical Patriarch's letter to the Pope of Alexandria, given in full in *Orthodoxia*, is the same as that sent to the other heads of Orthodox Churches.

We venture to direct the attention of readers to the article by Professor Basil Ioannides of the University of Saloniki on some aspects of the theology of St. Gregory Palamas. A careful study of his exposition is abundantly rewarding, since the knowledge of the place of Palamas in Orthodox theology and, it may justly be said, in the theology of the whole of Christendom is as yet little known or appreciated. Professor Ioannides in this study specially written for *The Christian East* gives us the form and shape of the Palamite system. For integrated system it is, the result not only of an inspired and brilliant mind, but the distillation of more than a thousand years' experience of the ascetical life, of the obscure workings of the soul called to contemplation of God. That life is one of continuous and uninterrupted prayer, as the link between the Creator and the creature, the bridge flung over the abyss that separates the Mysterious Being whom we worship (who in His Essence is beyond being or any category of human thought), the diamond-point on which turns the fruitful commerce between God and man. In so many ways theologically St. Gregory Palamas is the crown of Orthodox patristic theology. His largely unedited and untranslated works provide a deep mine for those who have sufficient grasp of his highly-evolved system to learn from them.

A valuable *Outline Guide to the Study of Eastern Christendom* has been compiled by the Rev. H. R. T. Brandreth, O.G.S., and published at 1/3 by S.P.C.K. One of the most frequent requests made to the liaison societies is for guidance in reading in the literature dealing with Eastern Christendom. Here is the answer to that. But the compilation is of value to the advanced student also and is very complete in its range. It covers General Surveys, both introductory and more advanced, the study of the Liturgy, Eastern Spirituality and Monasticism, Byzantine History, the Symbolical Books, the National Orthodox Churches, the Separated and Uniate Eastern Churches, Reunion, Iconography and Art, and Periodicals. This is not the first time that we are indebted to Father Brandreth for his compilations.

The range and quantity of the literature available to-day on the study of Orthodoxy is surprising. With the help of this pamphlet nobody should be without expert and enlightened guidance.

A comparatively new element in the life of the Orthodox Church is being introduced by the immigration into the British Commonwealth and the United States of America of Orthodox Christians from Europe and the Near East. This new element is important, since the Holy Orthodox Church is not bound to a universal liturgical language, however venerable the use of Greek, and much later Slavonic, is to her children. English is rapidly becoming the church language of great bodies of worshipping Orthodox, and the ancient and beautiful spirit of sixth and seventh century Liturgy is finding a new dress. It is clear also that such a development is likely to have its influence on our relations as Anglicans with the Holy Orthodox Church, and to bring us together more intimately than almost any other single bond. Our understanding as Anglicans of the Divine Liturgy and Offices of Eastern Christians is greatly hindered and obscured by the diversity of language and expression. It is likely to be correspondingly illuminated by the use of a common tongue.

It is computed that the number of Orthodox in the United States and the British Commonwealth must be over six millions. In the United States alone the Orthodox hierarchy claimed in 1943 to be speaking on behalf of five millions. In Canada there are over two hundred thousand Orthodox, mostly Ukrainians. Cyprus has over four hundred thousand. The number in Great Britain is at least fifty thousand, while in South Africa, Australia, as well as the Sudan there are flourishing dioceses, and in some cases, missions. The upheaval following the last war and the infiltration of Communism are beginning to have the unexpected result of spreading the Orthodox Faith all over the world, and the increasing power of Communism and its anti-Christian propaganda within the Iron Curtain is likely to intensify this dispora.

It is a frequent criticism of Orthodoxy that the missionary spirit, so conspicuous in the energies of the Anglican Communion, is absent during the past two hundred years. It is right and fair that that criticism should be met. In Orthodox lands in Europe, the energies of the peoples have been absorbed in maintaining their own existence under a non-Christian and at times persecuting rule, and in gaining their own freedom and independence. In this the Church has always taken the lead and given inspiration and purpose to the struggle. To-day in Orthodox countries suffering under the communist terror, it is significant that the clergy are singled out for the fiercest attack. In the case of the old Russia, there is a splendid record of missionary zeal in spreading the Christian Faith in North America, Siberia and Japan. In addition to this, the Balkan countries have been economically poor and hardly able to support their home church, let alone launch out in overseas evangelization. The possibility of missionary activity is visible now in mass emigration and the establishment of Orthodox communities all the world over.

Such communities have two inestimable advantages in common. They

all profess and practise the same holy faith and they use increasingly the same language, as their mother tongue or because they are bilingual.

Their weakness would appear to lie in their numerous divisions. They are not merely divided into several ethnical groups, but these groups are further divided by ecclesiastical or even political differences. While this is the situation, the energy of English-speaking Orthodoxy is likely to be wasted in party strife and parochialism of the narrow type. Yet if they could act as a body, they would constitute a spiritual and moral force that could not easily be disregarded in the world. Their own conviction and faith is clear: that Orthodoxy is not the property of any one nation or culture but is Catholic and eternal.

The Editing Committee of *The Christian East* makes bold to ask all present readers and subscribers to help them to increase the circulation of the periodical. Our financial difficulties would be almost entirely resolved if the present very small circulation can be doubled. Owing to the generosity of the Society of the Faith, the heavy expenses of the first year of publication (expenses that continue to mount steeply) have been met. But we need to stand more on our own feet. If each present subscriber were to undertake to make the effort to get even one more subscriber, we would be greatly aided. All contributions to the paper are unpaid, the task of preparing and editing is of necessity honorary. There is no real reason why we should not continue, in spite of hard times and small numbers. Other means of bringing the matter to the attention of churchpeople have been recommended by the General Committee of the Association and will be put into effect. We ask that a venture of faith undertaken by people already deeply immersed in parochial and other affairs may be saved for the great end of Reunion.

REVIEWS

ORTHODOXES UND EVANGELISCHES CHRISTENTUM. Studienheft Nr. 2. Kirche und Kosmos. Herausgegeben vom Kirchlichen Aussenamt der EKD. Witten Ruhr (Luther Verlag). 1949. 168 pages.

This is the second volume of the German series on "Orthodox and Evangelical Christendom," dealing with relations between Orthodoxy and Protestantism. For this reason it is very interesting to the Orthodox Church and Theology, and contains the following important studies:

1. E. Wolf, "The task of Symbolics to-day" (pp. 9–27).
2. E. Benz, "The meaning of Symbolics for the study of Theology and for the ministry" (pp. 28–44).
3. Rammelmeyer, "The meaning of Scripture for the Orthodox conception of the Church as the Body of Christ" (pp. 45–63).
4. D. Merz, "The Problem of Tradition in the Theology of the Reformers and in the present Protestant Church" (pp. 64–76).
5. L. Muller, "The meaning of Tradition in Orthodox Theology and the Orthodox Church" (pp. 77–97).
6. O. Weber, "Concern for the World as the task of the Protestant Churches" (pp. 98–113).

7. H. von Rautenfeld, "The Cosmos and the Church from an Orthodox viewpoint" (pp. 114–135).

8. "The origin of the Synodical power of the emperor in the time of Constantine the Great, its Theological foundation and its acceptance by the Church" (pp. 137–168) by A. Kartaschow and E. Wolf.

The whole work is prefixed by a preface (pp. 5–8) by G. Stratenwerth, in which it is recommended that Protestant theologians acquaint themselves better with the Orthodox Catholic Church, which to-day presents spiritual activity and "stands beside us as the elder sister" (p. 6).

Judging in general the aforesaid studies of the Protestant theologians, we see that a serious attempt is being made towards the understanding of Orthodoxy. Although we have many reservations and disagreements as to the individual parts, nevertheless in its entirety we can only express our joy and satisfaction in the effort undertaken, which has great significance from both the theological and the ecumenical aspect. Because we want to hope that the deep and complete and unbiased study of Orthodoxy by contemporary Protestant theologians will be able to lead them to perform now what the leaders of the Reformation during the sixteenth century neglected to do, that is, to re-examine with an objectivity that discerns them and with impartiality, yet with "responsible self-criticism" (p. 43) those teachings about which Orthodoxy and Protestantism differ (e.g. about the Church, Holy Tradition, Sacraments, church policy, justification, the saints, worship, monasticism, etc.) in comparison with and under the light of the teaching of the Orthodox Church, which has preserved the teaching of the ancient and undivided Church unchanged. This Professor E. Benz (p. 38 *seq.*) has initiated in the volume at hand, as well as some of the other contributors mentioned.

In this effort, Orthodox theologians should be able to assist them, cooperating with Old Catholic, Anglican and Lutheran colleagues in small conventions, organized by the World Council of Churches, as we have elsewhere suggested to it. (Study 49 E/607, pp. 25 and 27.) We, Orthodox theologians, believing that the Orthodox Catholic Church constitutes the unbroken and direct continuation of the ancient and undivided Church, standing between the two sister Churches, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant, and that she possesses the revealed truth in all its fullness and purity, are able to say with all humility to heterodox theologians: Search deeper into the Orthodox Church and Theology in reference to the ancient Church of the Seven Ecumenical Synods, which Church she perpetuates, and to her teaching, worship and organization, and then "ye shall know the truth . . ." (S. John viii. 32). Because, truly, "no one knows if and when the Lord of the Church will in the future like to put the Orthodox and the Evangelical Church side by side in fraternal proximity," as G. Stratenwerth writes (p. 7).

JOHN KARMIRIS.

PERIODICALS RECEIVED

Eastern Churches Quarterly. Vols. IX, Nos. 2 and 3, 1951.

Sobornost. (Twice yearly.) Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius.

Irénikon. Prieuré d'Amay. Semestres 1, 2 and 3, 1951.
Aktines. (Athens.) Monthly.
Ecclesia. (Athens.) Quarterly.
Orthodoxia. (Istanbul. Ecumenical Patriarchate.) Monthly.
Orthodox Life. (Russian.) U.S.A., 1, 2 and 3, 1951 (bi-monthly).
Apostolos Andreas. (Istanbul, newspaper publication.)
Zoe. (Athens.) Weekly publication.
Hellenike Kypros. (Monthly, illustrated, Cyprus.)
Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate. (Quarterly.) 1951. No. 1.
Oriente. (Spain.) Monthly.
Catholica Unio. (Fribourg.) Quarterly.
The Ecumenical Review. Quarterly.
The International Review of Missions. Quarterly.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE FAITH PRESS, LTD., LEIGHTON BUZZARD